

*Lincoln* 301  
S P E E C H

DELIVERED BY

COL. W. R. MORRISON,

AT EDWARDSVILLE, MADISON COUNTY, ILL.,

OCTOBER 13, 1863.

~~~~~

ST. LOUIS:

GEORGE KNAPP & CO., PRINTERS AND BINDERS.

1863.

EDWARDSVILLE, October 14, 1863.

Col. WM. R. MORRISON.

Dear Sir:—Your friends of Edwardsville, desirous of manifesting their appreciation of the able and statesmanlike Speech delivered by you in the Court-house of Edwardsville on the evening of Thursday, the 13th inst., and in order to have the principles set forth therein generally propagated, we respectfully solicit at your earliest convenience a publication of the same.

E. J. DORSEY,  
JAMES OLIVE,  
W. E. WHEELER,  
WM. T. BROWN,  
JAS. CHAPMAN,  
GEO. B. BURNETT,  
WM. S. HELM,

HOLL. WHITTINGTON,  
HENRY C. GERKE,  
B. D. BERRY,  
WM. STALLINGS,  
H. C. BARNSBACK,  
H. KELLER,  
*and others.*

# SPEECH OF COL. WM. R. MORRISON.

---

## *Necessity for Free Discussion.*

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Some of your citizens have expressed a desire to hear my views, which I was prevented by illness from expressing on the occasion of your late mass meeting, and which are only of any importance because of the trust you have so generously confided to me.

Our Government is involved in two seemingly "irrepressible conflicts"—one with armed treason and secession; the other with an illimitable, indescribable "military necessity." In both these conflicts we—the Democratic party—are for the Government and against its assailants. While the Administration, its adherents and allies, may be with us against armed treason and secession, they are against us and for this military necessity, alike dangerous to the Government; so that, between us and our political opponents there is another conflict, and altogether we have some strife and more confusion in the land. Believing, as we do, that our institutions are founded in principles of truth and justice unchangeable; that the people, the source of power, who make and unmake Administrations and Governments, are capable of comprehending and appreciating the worth of these institutions, we are not without hope of their ultimate triumph. That they may triumph, they must be understood; that they may be understood, they must be canvassed and discussed. If, in these discussions, we shall say aught which does not support the *efforts of the Administration*, and which is not warranted in fact, while we yet have the press and speech unabridged the means of our detection and exposure are ever at hand; if, however, we speak but the truth, the truth and our institutions founded therein must be maintained; they must live,

though the Administration and its puny efforts shall perish and be forgotten. Nor will we, if we are men and value our liberties, be deterred from this discussion by the venal cry of "Copperhead," "rebel sympathizer," "traitor," coming, as it does, from those who traffic in the misfortunes of the country and the blood of its children; nor again by an only noisy patriotism which so often compares the country in its imperilled condition to a house on fire, which must be "put out" before an inquiry is made as to who are the responsible villains. The gracious postponement of the inquiry, while the torch of treason consumes the "house," or the wicked double purpose of a faithless Administration removes its foundation rocks and secures its destruction, is at least an admission that others than those we are fighting have unclean hands; and, in the light of events of the last three years, who will not be convinced that, in this as in other great conflagrations, some of those who would have us believe them most in earnest "putting out," are in concert with those who are extending the fire for purposes of riot and plunder.

## *Our System of Government.*

Our ancestors, who, at great cost, secured their independence from the parent country; and who gave us this good Government, said, "in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity," they made the Constitution, and in which they conferred upon the agents of the people, the officers for the time charged with the administration of the Government in its several departments, power to do certain things to attain these high purposes.

Among others so conferred, was the power to "provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasion." "To declare war," "to raise and support armies," to suspend "the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* when, in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it." "To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States." For the attainment of the same purposes, and in the same instrument, (the Constitution,) in which our fathers gave to these agents of the people (the President and other officers) these powers, the power to do certain other things was denied to them under all circumstances whatsoever. Among the powers so denied was that of "abridging freedom of speech, or of the press," by these officers; "no person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on the presentment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia;" "nor be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law." "No attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood, or forfeiture, except *during the life of the person attainted*;" and "in all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and *public trial* by an *impartial jury* of the State and *district wherein the crime* shall have been committed." And, by thus denying the exercise of these powers, and conferring the exercise of those other powers, did these great men provide us with a Constitution, which, together with the laws made in pursuance thereof, and treaties made under the authority of the United States, was declared to be the supreme law of the land. It is a system of government embodying the will of the people. Whatever we may call it—whether Constitution, Government, supreme law of the land—it is not Mr. Lincoln. If we would continue in its enjoyment, we must preserve the Union of these States, with their equal rights unimpaired, because these constitute the very body of the system; to do which, we must maintain the Constitution, the bond of union, without which no union remains. To protect and

defend this Constitution, these several powers conferred and powers denied must be respected and obeyed, they being the principles laid down, or means provided, for the protection of our rights and liberties; they are the rules of action, the several parts making up in the whole the Constitution, which has no existence when these its several parts are destroyed. Whatever dangers now threaten us, come of disobedience to this supreme law, and may be averted by a return to, and sacred observance of, the duties it enjoins by all those whose supreme law it is. Take from the citizen the rights guaranteed in this supreme law and how much of liberty yet remains to him? In what else do our liberties consist than in the rights secured by these several powers conferred and denied? We went to war with the rebels because they struck at the more perfect union, and thereby made war on the Constitution in one of its most vital points, without which Constitution no Union exists against which to rebel. The Constitution overthrown, and the Southern States are no more a part of the Union—no more a part of our country—than is Canada a part of our Union, a part of our country. The Constitution overthrown, and we have no lawful rights; no duty to perform in the South, because without it we have nothing there against which the South is doing any wrong. Then, whoever, under any pretext, set the Constitution aside, in any of its provisions, are aiding and abetting Jeff. Davis in working out our national ruin. The blessings of liberty, secured to us through its provisions, are none the less effectually lost to us if the Constitution shall be stricken down by Northern madmen than if it fall by Southern traitors.

When this "more perfect Union" was threatened by the treasonable machinations of bold, bad Southern men—first seriously threatened, after it had been unfortunately determined to confide it to the keeping of the now *most* loyal party—we no longer remembered past party differences. We put aside all inquiries as to the blame which did justly belong to Abolition zealots, who built upon God's altar an unhallowed sectional strife, and those who, for base par-



tisan purposes, united with them, thus giving a pretext for this monstrous infamy. Our people united to ward off the danger threatening alike to all. All that was asked, and more, was given, in men and money, by both our own State and the National Legislature. Now, unfortunately, crimination and strife have taken the place of concert and unanimity; and are we, who have been true, or they who have been false to the rules of action which produced this unanimity and concert, responsible that they no longer exist? Who are to bear the blame that the Union is not yet saved? Certainly not the people who have given all, and more than was asked by its peculiar friends, for its preservation.

*Bad faith of the Administration and its abuse of power.*

His party elected Mr. Lincoln because he was unfriendly to slavery as it existed in the Southern States, and against which he had made threats. These threats slavery feared he would attempt unlawfully to execute when he had been elected, and it demanded guarantees; it asked of Mr. Lincoln and his party who had made threats, a bond, to keep the peace—not to violate the law. We believed the public peace should be secured by giving the bond, and to this end numerous propositions were proposed in Congress to protect the South from real or imaginary dangers: one by Mr. Crittenden, another by Mr. Douglas, who said, “the South would take my proposition if the Republicans would agree to it.” They would not agree to it; we know the consequences—rather, we know the beginning of the end. When they could have secured an honorable adjustment, they had not the manliness to do it; and when it was too late, the Administration and its friends became frightened in their turn. To secure the co-operation of the Democratic party, which had but little faith in the honesty and law-abiding purpose of this *loyal* party, they seemingly abandoned the policy which secured their political triumph, and organized Territories leaving the vexed question of slavery to be settled by the people interested. They promised to re-

deem their pledges, made in the Chicago platform, of economy, and in favor of “the maintenance of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively.” They officially declared in Congress their purpose, in the prosecution of the war, to be in accordance with the law and the constitution, by the adoption of the Crittenden resolution. They declared in the same way, substantially, of their power and purposes in relation to slavery what Mr. Lincoln said in his inaugural address: “I declare that I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists; that I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and have no inclination to do so.” These declarations accomplished the purpose for which they were made. The Democratic party believed them; the people of all parties believed them, and were united in their determination to maintain these declared and lawful purposes.

Drunk of temporary success, and with it power and plunder, the Administration was false alike to its pledges and its trusts. When by our victories at Forts Henry and Donelson we were enabled to give the people of West Tennessee the protection of the national flag and authority, against which many of them had done no wrong, the Administration gave them instead, as a Union saving offering, a scheme of confiscation which violates all the salutary provisions of our organic law to which I have referred, and which provide that “no attainder of treason shall work a forfeiture except during the life of the person attainted,” and then only after conviction, with the right of trial by jury, and right to due process of law respected. By this scheme, without a trial or conviction, the property is taken—not, as the constitution provides, during the life of the guilty, but taken absolutely and forever, and the crimes of guilty men thus visited upon innocent women and children. Then for the first time men learned in the principles and safeguards which protect our liberties became alarmed at the blow thus inflicted, not

upon the guilty, but upon the supreme law of the land, the only protection for the innocent; and men not so learned, but who are devoted to the institutions of their fathers, began to inquire if other men, whatever may be their crimes, are denied such rights as they have not yet forfeited, how long shall we retain our rights? They began to inquire if these were the measures which were to arouse that "latent Union sentiment," and bring back the people of the South to the performance of such duties of the citizen as are necessary to preserve the Union.

When the rebel flag flaunted in sight of the Capitol, and when it is said the pickets had to be doubled to enable the "Government" to sleep sound, these country loving people, who had resolved at Chicago that they must be put in power to save the people's money, purchased, without the consent of the owners or the people, the slaves in the District of Columbia, fixing the price of each at three hundred dollars, the value placed upon the life of a poor white man in the conscription bill. Then the people began to inquire who was to pay for these negroes, and what their freedom had to do with saving the Union. Having declared as a part of their political faith, to secure power, that each State should control its own institutions and that its rights should be kept inviolate, and with that provision of the constitution which says "no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State without the consent of the Legislature of the State concerned," constituting part of the law they have sworn to obey,—the President and Congress who are fighting—no, who are making other people fight—to uphold the law of the land, did for Old Virginia, which gave Illinois to the Union, what Jeff. Davis would do for the Union—they cut it in two; one of their leaders (Mr. Stephens of Pennsylvania) declaring that they did so without warrant in the constitution. Then men began to inquire, if the President and Congress may divide a State without warrant in the constitution, why may not the Union be divided in the same way? If we fight Jeff. Davis for offering to di-

vide the Union, shall we be astonished that Virginians fight us for dividing Virginia?

Foolishly supposing he had men enough to lay waste the Southern States; false to the pledge in his inaugural, that he had "no purpose to interfere with the institution of slavery where it exists and that he had no lawful right to do so,"—the President issued his emancipation proclamation, striking down, as he claims forever, property in millions of slaves, not excepting those of loyal men, of women, of children—no, not even those of Mr. Douglas' children. If the President had "no lawful right to do so" at his inauguration, when and where did he get that lawful right? If he may do what he has no lawful right to do, why may not other men do what they have no lawful right to do? Why may not Jeff. Davis divide the Union with no lawful right to do so?

We are told by Mr. Lincoln and his attorneys, in justification of this act, a hundred days' notice was given Jeff. Davis, that if he did not "avert" it by ceasing his attempts to destroy the Union, ceasing to do what he had no lawful right to do, that our President would do what he had no "lawful right to do;" he would do that in fear of which the Southern people had been induced to commit treason; he would divide the people of the North by disclosing his unlawful purpose; he would unite the people of the South by adding their interests to their prejudices and passions; that is to say, our President would help Jeff. Davis in his work in law-breaking, unless it should be discontinued in one hundred days. And because Jeff. Davis did not "avert" it, Mr. Lincoln is to be excused for faith unkept and laws violated. Again they tell us that Mr. Lincoln, President, declared he had no lawful right and no purpose to interfere with slavery; while Mr. Lincoln, Commander in Chief, issued the proclamation, who had the lawful right; that therefore no pledge is unkept, no law violated. But Mr. Seward, in his correspondence with Mr. Dayton at the French court, after war was inaugurated and Mr. Lincoln might do what is lawful for the Commander in Chief to do, says: "the new

President, as well as the citizens through whose suffrages he has come into the administration, has always repudiated all designs whatever and wherever imputed to them and him of disturbing the system of slavery as it is existing under the Constitution and laws. That any such effort on his part would be unconstitutional, and all his actions in that direction would be prevented by the judicial authority even though they were assented to by Congress and the people." If Mr. Seward has not settled the question—speaking for Mr. Lincoln as he does—suppose that, without any rebellion by the Southern people, he as Commander in Chief had issued his proclamation declaring their slaves free, who, then, would have claimed the act to have been consistent with the supreme law of the land? Gov. Aikin of South Carolina, reported in prison for bearing true allegiance to the United States, owns a thousand slaves, many thousands are owned by widows and children, some by Mr. Douglas' children. Gov. Aikin or other loyal men have made no war; these women and children have made no war, no rebellion; they have done no act to deprive them of any rights under the Constitution; the invalid acts of secession cannot change their relations to the Government of the United States, to which they owe paramount allegiance. We are fighting to maintain the same Constitution we had before the war; then how it is that, what was before the war unconstitutional as to them and is now not unconstitutional while their relations remain the same to that instrument, is a proposition which I could not comprehend; and when the proclamation made its appearance, I entered my protest against the filthy thing.

Mr. Hale, a loyal Republican Senator, said in the Senate:

"I declare it on my responsibility as a Senator of the United States, that the liberties of this country are in greater danger to-day, from the corruptions and profligacy practised in the various departments of this Government, than they are from the open enemy in the field."

If, as Mr. Hale says, the greatest danger to our liberties is from the corruptions of

loyal men calling themselves the only friends of the Government, shall it continue without complaint? Shall we fight those doing least, and not be allowed to complain of those doing most to destroy our liberties? Mr. Senator Chandler, of blood-letting notoriety, said to his brother Republican Senators:

"The Senate have deliberately voted to take from two to three hundred million dollars out of the Treasury of the United States, and put it into the hands of these thieves and robbers."

Then the people began to inquire if this too was saving the Union? If it was, they desired to know how many millions more the thieves and robbers wanted, to make the Union quite safe. When that can be ascertained, I am in favor of giving them the millions of dollars to save the men.

Mr. Dawes, whose loyalty will not be doubted, (he represented a district in Massachusetts,) said: "That somebody has plundered the public Treasury well nigh as much in that single year as current yearly expenses of the Government during the administration which the people hurled from power because of its corruptions." Then people began to think seriously of sending that "somebody," who could beat "Old Buck's" administration, "plundering," down to steal the Southern Confederacy, as a measure of economy.

Mr. Van Wick, another conscience-stricken sinner of the loyal party, said: "That species of fraud which shocked the nation in 1861, has been increasing," and men begin to inquire how many shocks the nation could yet endure. They become anxious to know if that sacred precept which says, "thou shalt not steal," applies to governments,—fearing that we were in danger of losing ours, as one Ward lost his ducks. But in answer to all these inquiries we are told it is disloyal to thus "tie the hands of the Government;" well, I submit, to the certain prejudice of my loyalty, that a *government*, which, like ours, cannot keep its hands out of the people's pockets, ought to have them tied.

Mr. Conway, an unconditional Republican supporter of the Administration "in



its efforts," offered for the adoption of the last Congress this proposition:

*"Resolved, That the Executive be, and he is further, requested, to enter into negotiations with the authorities of the Confederate States with reference to a cessation of hostilities, based on the following propositions:*

*"1st. Recognition of the independence of the Confederate States!"*

Has Mr. Vallandigham, has any Democrat, ever proposed such a monstrous proposition? But Democrats are without "due process of law" imprisoned, deprived of their liberty; Mr. Vallandigham, without the presentment of a grand jury against him, without a trial in his district before a jury, is by force and violence dragged before a tribunal unknown to the law, insulted by a mock trial and driven among the enemy; while Mr. Conway, the very loyal co-laborer of A. Lincoln, with other unconditional Union men, are "marching on" *saving the Union*. At their Springfield mass meeting our loyal Republican friends "Resolved, that the strength of our Government consists in the respect of the people for the laws and its constituted authorities;" and, further, that whoever destroys this respect, "is an enemy to republican liberty." Can constituted authorities, whose acts are thus characterized by fraud, violence and political partiality, secure the respect of the people? Who can respect constituted authorities who do not themselves respect the constitutional guarantees which they have sworn to respect? Can laws made, as Mr. Stephens declared the law dividing the State of Virginia was made, without warrant in the Constitution, secure the respect of the people, when they have declared in that instrument that no law shall be made without warrant therein? Can constituted authorities sworn not to violate those provisions of the Constitution, which were violated in the arrest by violence, the mock trial and fraudulent conviction of Mr. Vallandigham, secure the respect of the people? Will the people respect constituted authorities who, sworn not to abridge the freedom of the press and speech, prevent this freedom, unless it is exercised in lauding the infamies of this

Administration? Mr. Chase flippantly declares, "commerce follows the flag," and then by a dash of the pen does for Western commerce what five hundred thousand Southern bayonets could not do; he blockades the Mississippi against it.

Suppose that one of you having read from Mr. Chase's bulletin, "commerce follows the flag," and then from Mr. Lincoln's bulletin, the "'Father of Waters' again goes unvexed to the sea," shall attempt to ship the products of your fields, and for that purpose shall visit a constituted authority in St. Louis, he will charge you five per cent. on the value for the privilege; suppose that, not satisfied with the arrangement, you shall remind him that the constituted authorities in New York and Boston do not charge this five per cent.; and suppose, to convince him that he should not, you read from the Constitution, "no preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another," what answer do you think the constituted authority would give you? "Copperhead!" How much respect would you still have for that constituted authority? We, who so often welcome to our national hospitalities those forced to flee their homes and native land, have not done so, I trust, because these refugees have overturned social order, producing riot and bloodshed, but because they have resisted bad laws, bad rulers, bad administrations of government. May we not learn, then, in this manifestation of the sentiments of a free people that laws and constituted authorities will receive the respect of the people in whatever degree the people shall feel that these laws and constituted authorities secure the ends, the liberties and equal rights of the citizen, the only legitimate purpose for which laws are enacted, authorities constituted. Those who have destroyed this feeling of security by overriding the people's will, and striking down legal safeguards, without which there is no security, are the enemies of republican liberty. We must and will obey the laws made by the tribunals authorized to make laws; we must respect constituted authorities in the performance of their le-



gal duties—not in their violations of law. *Freemen trust only in the law for the security of their liberties.*

How can you discharge the duties of citizens under our system of government without this freedom of the press and speech? How, without this, are you to ascertain whether I, or any other of your accredited agents, shall faithfully perform the trust you have confided to me or them? How shall you be informed of the proper persons to select and to entrust as your representatives and agents? What protection for your rights and liberties have you if you are denied this due process of law, and public trial by jury? Are you not already condemned before you are arrested, condemned by the same accusation through which you are arrested? At your mass meeting, that truly eloquent man, Hon. James C. Allen, told you that the ballot box was the last citadel of your liberties which you dare not surrender; that if its freedom was violated, it would be your duty to open the way to it with bayonets. Brave words, but they contain not half your duty. The freedom of the press, and the freedom of speech, which was stricken down in the illegal arrest of Mr. Vallandigham for its exercise, are the pickets and outposts to this citadel of your liberties. Let these be captured, and the enemy will come upon you like a thief in the night.

My friends, if in the changing fortunes of war, your city, your homes, shall be threatened by the armed foe, and you too shall have to take arms in self-defence, will you then quietly rest upon your arms in Edwardsville while the enemy approaches and captures your outposts, your surrounding villages, cuts off your communications with your friends, your means of supply and escape, leaving you at his mercy? I trust not; but if you did, you would be as competent to protect your homes as is a people to protect their liberties who rest in security while the press and speech are being stricken down and hope to save their liberties at the ballot box. Every illegal, unwarranted encroachment upon the rights of citizens, to which they submit, is upon their part an act of self-abasement, and ed-

ucates them for despotism. Only make ready for them your Mexico, and you will find your Napoleon and Maximillian; nor need you go to France or Austria to look for them. How long will men, who through fear suffer the law to be broken, maintain their rights against the law-breakers? We have no security but in the majesty of the law. When we shall have failed to obtain our rights at the hands of Mr. Lincoln, as President of the United States, think you we will obtain them from Mr. Lincoln, the leader of the Republican party? Mr. Vallandigham stands like a bantam cock, crowing across the Canada line; if the people of Ohio are capable of protecting their liberties, they will see to it, that he goes home and has the rights which by the law are his. If he is a traitor, let him suffer the penalties of treason. If I was an Ohioan as I am an Illinoisan, I would share the responsibility of vindicating the rights without which *liberty* means nothing.

#### *Constitutional Power to Suppress Rebellion.*

In their anxiety to have other people seem as regardless of constitutional obligations as themselves, the Administration send wandering heroes through the country to harangue the people into the belief that it is constitutional to suppress rebellion! The heroes having exercised themselves for a short time in asserting what no one denies, they cease to "shell the woods," and "move upon our works," by insisting that because it is constitutional to suppress rebellion, it is constitutional to do any other act which their chief shall direct, provided only he call it saving the Union. It does not follow that because we may lawfully suppress insurrection, it is therefore lawful to make a raid upon the inhabitants of the moon. When the Constitution provides that one thing may, another may not be done, it is violated if both be done. Suppose that, by it, Mr. Lincoln is authorized—which is not conceded—to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus* when in time of rebellion he may think the public safety requires it. It does not follow that because a rebellion exists which it is lawful to suppress, he can therefore cause to be judged

and condemned persons charged with crime, and yet deny to them due process of law and trial by impartial jury in the district where the crime is committed, which the Constitution says shall *not* be denied; and in it no provision is made for the suspension of these rights. If his will is supreme law, the old man may take it into his head that the public safety requires the suspension of elections for President for the remainder of his natural life. If the public safety is to be attained in that way, that too will be called saving the Union. Nor will he fail to find men to support him in his "efforts." But we are asked why we do not complain of the illegal abuses committed by Jeff. Davis. That arch-traitor proclaims his purpose to destroy the Union. We would save it. His purpose is accomplished by overthrowing the Constitution; ours cannot be attained in the same way.

#### *"War Democracy."*

Those apparently most in earnest in asserting the constitutional right to suppress rebellion—a right which no party denies—are the party which recently met at Decatur. Not yet fully up to the requirements of "military necessity," these white-black-birds—Albino allies of the Administration—are put in the "awkward squad" placed under the command of the late Abolition candidate for Congress in the State at large, and christened "War Democracy." Representing a party—themselves—the squad passed resolutions finding much fault with Democrats, none with Republicans. Democrats do not usually hold conventions to find fault with other Democrats, but meet and counsel with them. But no one will fail to understand this species of war Democracy. There are but two parties; he who is not for the Democratic party, the Constitution, Union and laws, is for military necessity—the filthy covering with which stealthy power attempts to hide its aggressions. These (two dozen it is said) civic and military gentlemen resolved that "we" denounce the Democratic party of Illinois. Well, that denouncing is much like one of these same gentlemen sending me to take Fort

Donelson with two regiments. Quite likely the Democracy will be denounced as I took the fort—not much. But this is not all the "war Democracy" at Decatur resolved to do: they resolved to build a railroad to the Pacific, a ship canal from the lakes to the Mississippi; drive the French out of Mexico, because the old world was large enough, and must cease to grow any more in this direction; to colonize four millions of negroes, and to suppress the rebellion. This "war Democracy" certainly should have given Mr. Hoe, of printing press notoriety, some encouragement; they ought to have resolved for the largest liberty of the press, for if all the presses in Christendom were set to work and each made impressions as large as Madison county, they would not print greenbacks enough before the millennium to pay the cost of what is to be done by this two dozen "war Democracy."

#### *The 23d Resolution—Offensive War.*

In the exercise of their right "peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances," which right, in order to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity, our fathers declared should never be abridged, the Democracy of our State met in June last and

"*Resolved*, That the further offensive prosecution of this war tends to subvert the Constitution and the Government, and entail upon this nation all the disastrous consequences of misrule and anarchy; that we are in favor of peace upon the basis of a restoration of the Union, and for the accomplishment of which we propose a National Convention to settle upon terms of peace, which shall have in view the restoration of the Union as it was, and the securing, by constitutional amendments, such rights to the several States and the people thereof as honor and justice demands."

Which has thrown all those who "support the Government in its efforts" to keep the offices, off the Rebels on the "Copperheads." The resolution is for peace on the basis of a preserved Union; for a National Convention to settle upon terms honorable and just, and, if necessary to this end, to amend the Constitution, and against the *offensive* prosecution of the war. Have we not always claimed that

the war was, on our part, to save the Union and for no other purpose? If this is true, has any *Union* man ought to urge against peace on the basis of a preserved Union? In his last message the President recommended amendments to the Constitution to secure the freedom of the slaves in Missouri. If it is patriotic to amend it for the negroes, is it less patriotic to do the same thing for the Union? or is the maintenance of the Union of less moment than the freedom of these Africans, with whom we have no lawful right to interfere? Among his first official acts, Mr. Lincoln recommended a National Convention to amend the Constitution. Then, certainly these most loyal of men are not going to abandon the "Government's" own proposition for fear of being called *Copperheads*. Forgetting these propositions of their chief in their enthusiasm, his Albino allies at Decatur said: "nor do we believe it just, wise or honorable to call a convention during the present rebellion for the purpose of amending the Constitution. Only think of this "awkward squad" telling their commander-in-chief that his own propositions are neither "wise," "just," nor "honorable!" In the State of New York, with greater consideration for the acts of their loyal head, his followers resolved to permit no amendments to the Constitution, except as provided by itself. We propose none other. Our fathers once amended the Constitution, engrafting no new principles, but better securing the rights it was made to secure. They provided that we too might do likewise if it became necessary to accomplish the purposes of its adoption. When our fathers rebelled against British rule, they were told that they, like other British subjects, had the British Constitution. They were not satisfied with this information, but demanded to know whether, having that Constitution, power was claimed to tax them without representation. They rebelled, not against the British Constitution, but the British interpretation of it. The great majority of the Southern people believe they are rebelling against an intended unlawful Republican interpretation of our

Constitution, with which that party had threatened them. We are willing to amend the Constitution to prevent the execution of these unlawful threats; and thus save both the Union and Constitution. But that which in this resolution has caused most uneasiness to the loyal phalanx of office keepers and money savers, is our opposition to the *offensive* prosecution of the war. After the war began, all parties in Congress voted for Mr. Crittenden's resolution, declaring "that the present deplorable civil war has been forced upon the country by the disunionists of the Southern States; \* \* \* that this war is not waged upon our part in any spirit of oppression, or for any purpose of conquest or subjugation, or for the purpose of overthrowing or of interfering with the rights and established institutions of those States; but to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution, and to preserve the Union, with all the dignity, equality, and rights of the several States unimpaired." \* \* \* This was approved by the people. Under their obligations of office Owen Lovejoy, C. L. Vallandigham, Gen. John A. McClernand, and Gen. John A. Logan, voted for it. A war thus forced upon us, in which we were compelled to defend the Union, Constitution and laws, was a war in self-defence—defensive, not offensive.

Fort Sumter is the property of the United States. When it was attacked by armed traitors, we in defending it were defending our own property; our own rights—not prosecuting an offensive war. The Constitution of the United States provides for the suppression of insurrection—rebellion—by force of arms, and for that lawful purpose the territory of Tennessee or any other State is the territory of the people of the United States, and may be occupied by them to "defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution and to preserve the Union, with all the dignity, rights and equality of States unimpaired," in self-defence, and they do not thereby prosecute an offensive war. In such a war, for a lawful purpose, did our men go forth to do battle; such a war we were willing to prosecute to the last extremity. Demo-



crats gave freely their votes, resources, their lives, in its prosecution. We would give them to-day as freely as when we were falsely and fraudulently told by Mr. Lincoln and his party that only in defence of these were our sacrifices required.

If, however, we occupy any of these States to do what we have no "lawful right to do," we are then invading these States; we are then making the war offensive on our part, violating the Constitution, and producing anarchy, by prosecuting the war "in a spirit of oppression," for the purpose of overthrowing and interfering with the rights and established institutions of these States." We were against such a warfare in the beginning; Mr. Lincoln and his party solemnly pledged themselves against it. They have falsified their pledges, and are now for it. Gen. Logan, Gen. McClelland and Owen Lovejoy, with Mr. Vallandigham, under their official oaths, declared themselves against it. We are against it now and forever. Mr. Douglas was against it. In his Springfield speech, which forever canonized him in the hearts of the abolition Republican people—after he was dead—he not only said: "there can be but two parties, patriots and traitors;" but he said:

"I will never sanction nor acquiesce in any warfare whatever upon the Constitutional rights or domestic institutions of the people of the Southern States. On the contrary, if there was an attempt to invade those rights, *to stir up servile insurrection among their people, I would rush to their rescue*, and interpose with whatever strength I might possess, to defend them from such calamity."

And again, he said:

"Hence, I repeat that I am not prepared to take up arms, or to sanction a policy of our Government to take up arms, to make any *inroads* against the rights of the Southern States; *upon their domestic institutions; upon the rights of person or property*; but, on the contrary, *would fly to their defence and protect them* from assault; but while that is the case, I will never cease to urge my countrymen to take up arms and fight to the death in defence of our indefeasible rights. Hence, if a war does come, it is a war of *self-defence* on our part."

Here, then, is the testimony of that man of great mind, who became the idol of our

very loyal opponents too late for the country's honor and the country's good, that a war in defence of our indefeasible rights was a war in self-defence wherever it might be waged. He tells us that he would never cease to urge his countrymen to fight in such a war to the death. But he tells us that he would sanction no warfare upon the "domestic institutions of the Southern States;" that if there was an attempt to invade these rights, or to stir up servile insurrection among the people, he would fly to their rescue; that if the Government made any inroads upon the rights of person or property he would fly to their defence. He, then, did not regard inroads upon their rights of person or property warfare upon their domestic institutions, or stirring up servile insurrection among the Southern people, as our indefeasible rights, which we could everywhere secure by war in self-defence. He regarded these acts as offensive, this warfare so offensive, that he would rush to the rescue, fly to the defence of the Southern people if it was attempted. Have the negroes of the South not been told that they are free and may rightfully assert their freedom at the expense of the lives of their masters, and is that not what Mr. Douglas meant by an attempt to stir up servile insurrection? "There can be but two parties" to that stirring up; which did Mr. Douglas tell us he would "rescue?" The slaves of Mr. Douglas' children have been proclaimed free by the Commander-in-chief, who says the proclamation "is law and valid, or is not valid." But no matter whether valid or invalid, seven hundred thousand bayonets make it valid. "There can be but two parties" to this "inroad" on the right of property of Mr. Douglas' children; of which did he tell us he would "fly to their defence?"

For saying upon another occasion what I have now said in substance, a paper published here—the Advertiser—makes me say:

"A war of invasion is not an offensive war if it is carried on in upholding the rights of the invaders."

Those entitled to be believed say that I am indebted for the honor of this notice to Judge "Joe" Gillespie, who is a very re-



spectable, because a very old man. He knows the law, because he is a Judge. He is a war man, *over forty-five years of age*. He, in this newspaper article, attempts to play fool that he may not seem a knave. I did not say "a war of invasion is not an offensive war if it is carried on in upholding the rights of the invaders," nor anything that a man having any respect for the truth can so interpret. I said substantially, and say now, that a war to maintain the supremacy of the Constitution and to preserve the Union, or to do any other act authorized by the Constitution, is not a war of invasion, not an offensive war, though it be prosecuted in every State in the Union; that, for the attainment of these ends, the territory of any and every State belongs to us, the whole people, and may be thus occupied by us in self-defence.

When John Morgan and his followers made their raid into Ohio they invaded that State, and made offensive war on the citizens of Ohio and of the United States. When our army went into that State to protect it against invasion, we did not invade it, nor were we prosecuting an offensive war. And why was Morgan's occupation of that State offensive and an invasion while ours was not? Because he occupied that State in violation of the Constitution, in violation of law; we, in obedience to both. The territory of Ohio is the territory of the United States for the purpose which we occupied it; it is not the territory of John Morgan's band for the purposes which they sought to occupy it. Nor is the law and the right changed if we go to Virginia rather than Ohio; nor whether his followers or our army might have been composed of citizens of a Northern or Southern State. Nor can we change the law or the right by declaring a purpose to do a lawful act, if we do an unlawful one instead. John Morgan's army went to Ohio to violate law; to do what they had no lawful right to do. In doing so they prosecuted an offensive war, and invaded that State. If we go to Georgia with our army to violate law, to do what we have no lawful right to do, we invade that State; we prosecute an offensive war though we may

call it saving the Union. Whoever believes that when our army enters upon the territory of a Southern State it thereby invades such State and prosecutes an offensive war is a Secessionist, whether he be Judge, knave or fool, because the 4th Art., 4th Sec. of the Constitution says: "The United States shall protect each of them (the States) against invasion;" hence, we may not invade a State. Once admit, as this learned Judge does, that the entering of a Southern State by our army is an invasion and an offensive war, and we are at the mercy of evil-doers, without the Constitutional power to suppress rebellion. But the Judge thinks "Vattel and other stupid fellows, who have been writing on military affairs for ages, might have saved themselves a great deal of trouble, if they had, like our friend, Bill Morrison, ignored the distinction between war carried on in an enemy's country and those carried on at home."

Herein we may learn the difference between us and our opponents, as well as the different purposes for which we were willing to prosecute a war. For every legitimate purpose sought to be attained by the prosecution of this war, there is no "enemy's country," it is all "home." South Carolina is our country. What right have we to waste blood and treasure in fighting for it if it is not our country? All of the Southern States are our country. By the Constitution they are made a part of the more perfect Union. How have they become the enemy's country? Are these *Union* judges at last turned secessionists; and do they admit the validity of the acts of secession? How else can it be that these States, which were part of our country, are no longer so? The judge must learn to look upon this whole country as ours, South as well as North; then he may comprehend the distinction between offensive and defensive warfare. Our views of duty to the country did never accord in time of war. While I was in Mexico, doing the best I could in defending the honor of our flag, at seven dollars per month, he and other "heirs of the aspirations of John Brown," were encouraging the Mexicans to

welcome me with "bloody hands and hospitable graves." When but a twelve months ago I was down in what he calls the enemy's country, but what I call our own country, doing the best I could to ward off the blows that treason would inflict upon it, he was saving the Union "in these ends of the earth" by doubting my loyalty, and that of all men who refused to vote the Republican ticket.

This resolution was adopted as a substitute for one offered by General Singleton, declaring the war unconstitutional in the beginning, declaring substantially of this what Mr. Lincoln did of the Mexican war. The terribly loyal men think the General a traitor; men are not traitors while they obey all the laws of the country, and perform every duty required of the citizen. If men will but obey the laws, I can tolerate some freedom of thought; why cannot the Administration and its allies tolerate such freedom; are the laws not of their own making? When a man says: if I made your laws, I would make no war in what I believe to be a fruitless attempt to cement the Union by blood, but you who are legally chosen to make laws, have made them for war; I, as a loyal citizen, do and will obey them; I can understand him, and believe he will obey the laws. How can such a man be a traitor, unless Mr. Lincoln was one during the Mexican war? If he was, we have a precedent for compromising with traitors.

#### *Conciliation and Compromise.*

With impotent, but malignant rage, those who believe as General Jackson, Mr. Jefferson, and other great men, of other and better days, believed, that this Union is not to be maintained by force alone, are denounced as "Copperheads," "rebel sympathizers," and "traitors," for presuming to think of compromising with "traitors." Well, I would compromise with traitors to save this Union. Mr. Douglas, whose patriotism, now that he is dead, is endorsed by all those who are so terrified by the word compromise, offered to compromise with these men threatening to become traitors, and he said, "the South (these

traitors) would take my proposition, but the Republicans will not agree to it." That great man, with the promptings of a pure patriotism, to prevent war, offered terms of conciliation to men threatening to commit treason. He believed the Republicans ought to accede to such terms to prevent war. We believed so then, we still believe they ought to accede to these terms of conciliation, to secure peace on the basis of a preserved Union. In his inaugural address Mr. Lincoln said:

*"Suppose you go to war; you cannot fight always; and when, after much loss on both sides, and no gain on either, you cease fighting, the identical questions as to terms of intercourse are again upon you. This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right in amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember and overthrow it."*

Since Mr. Lincoln thinks we cannot fight always, and that when we cease fighting these questions in dispute will be still unsettled, we propose to allow the people who inhabit the country, and to whom Mr. Lincoln says it belongs the exercise of—"not their revolutionary right to dismember and overthrow it"—"but their constitutional right in amending it," "the existing government," as provided by itself, and thus settle their difficulties. We have had the "much loss on both sides," and "no gain," at least on theirs; they are convinced that they cannot whip five Illinois Yankees; we do not want the cost, in the blood of brave men, of convincing them any more thoroughly if it can be avoided by honorable compromise—and what sacrilegious abolition fanatic will say that Crittenden and Douglas offered compromises which were inconsistent with their country's honor? Then in view of the dangers still threatening the country, and the cost in valuable life and treasure yet to be expended in removing these dangers—in view of all the facts, is it disloyal, is it against the Union, the Government, is it against the soldiers or the cause in which they believe they are fighting, to offer terms of compromise, to permit the people, to whom Mr. Lincoln

says the country belongs, to settle their difficulties as to terms of intercourse, which he says will have to be settled by them whenever, and however, the war may terminate? What more do these *best* Union men want than a settlement—than peace—with the Union preserved, and the Government maintained in its integrity? Were they not in good faith when they induced men to go to war in defence of these, declaring they had no purposes of oppression or of interference with the established institutions of the States? What more do these *best* friends of the soldiers want than peace with a whole Union? Have they not war enough? Do they want more widows, more orphans, more gallant men torn and mangled? do they still cry for blood? Do these men fighting for peace tell us that the rebels will accept no terms but a recognition of their independence? how do they know? Mr. Douglas told us the South would have taken his proposition and thus avoided war, if these men who want to continue fighting for peace would have agreed to it. If the South would have taken such a proposition, then why will they not take it now? is war any more inviting to them after their three years of terrible experience? But the "Government," say they, "makes no offers of peace." Is that not because they can expect nothing but confiscation and emancipation, to obtain peace from an Administration which refused all terms of compromise offered to prevent war? In what better condition do the Union saving offerings proposed by the Administration leave the rebels, if they submit, than if they contend? If they submit, they lose their lives and property; they lose no more if they contend.

The President's *Lincoln-letter* to his Springfield friends says, in justification of his negro proclamation, that "*negroes*, like other people, act upon motive; that he promised them freedom to get them to stake their lives for us; and the promise being made, *must be kept*." Well, if he keeps that promise with the negroes, he will act in better faith than he has with white men. But, if the President earnestly desires to save the Union,—since he has discovered

that not only negroes, but "other people" act from motive,—will he not furnish a "motive" to the Southern people to cease fighting? Will he not cease to prolong this terrible struggle, and make peace to the rebels less dangerous than war? What, think you, would be the effect upon the Southern people of an offer, in good faith of protection to life and property, with such guaranties for the future as were offered them by the patriots Crittenden and Douglas? Think you they would not take it? Are the men of the South so different from other men that their reverses and disappointments, the pain, suffering and death that they are working out for themselves, have no effect upon them? I think not. I know a little of some of these things improved my accommodating disposition very much. But those who would consent to no compromise to prevent war, will have no compromise with "traitors" to secure peace. Have they not already compromised with them? Hanging is the penalty for treason. In the canvass of 1860, in a harangue which that old blood-letting patriot, Senator Chandler of Michigan, delivered at the village of my residence, he said to his followers: "Don't listen to these dough-faced Union savers; vote for freedom, and when we elect our men, let slave drivers secede if they dare. Secession will be treason, and they who commit treason *we* will hang. I say, if this Union is not strong enough to hang traitors, let this Union go to hell." Well, he who made this chaste senatorial declaration did not hang traitors, but the acts of himself and his party seem to indicate their acceptance of the other alternative. They compromised the hanging with traitors. In passing along the river, where these "traitors" that were all to be hanged are being sent North, you can see, if you take that trouble, General, Colonel and Captain traitor, and General, Colonel and Captain Union travelling together in the cabin, compromising so as to take their toddies together; and the poor Southern soldier, (traitor,) who, by these very toddy-taking fellows, has been forced to commit treason, is travelling on deck, feasting on hard crackers. All traitors are equal be-



fore the law, whether they be called General or simply Joe Johnson; but we have so far compromised as to recognize these distinctions. Why, if a "traitor" is called General Joseph Johnson, we get forty-six men in exchange for him; if he is called simply Joe Johnson, we get but one. In fact, this thing has two sides to it; we manage but one, and that is terribly botched. We have made all the compromises with traitors necessary to a most bloody war. Is it not as honorable to compromise with the same men, traitors thought they be, to obtain peace?

But these unconditional Union men won't compromise with Jeff. Davis; they won't have the Union unless his head is unconditionally cut off. Well, we have no objection to taking his head off if it don't cost too much; though it's a pity we could not save the contents. Suppose his head ought to come off: will Senator Sumner, Chandler, or Mr. Secretary Chase any sooner give their heads for his than will Gov. Seymour, Vallandigham or Story of the Chicago Times? No! Admit that his head ought to come off: will Mr. Lincoln give his head for Jeff's? No! Then, why shall we give another fifty thousand Illinoisans for it, even with the prospect of having a few hundred thousand negroes added to the unconditional Union-coveted trophy. I do not believe, with Mr. Vallandigham, that we "cannot conquer the South," unless he means that we cannot maintain the Union by *force alone*. Whether we *will* conquer the South or not, is another question. With Africa for an ally we might conquer the rebels, England and France, and the other nations of the earth; but it would doubtless cost us many good men, which we would save to the country. And when we have done this, we have yet no Union, for, in the language of Mr. Lincoln, "the identical questions as to terms of intercourse are again upon you." When we have given man for man until there is but one man left in the South, and when we have torn one limb from his body, we will have many of our own men like him, who, if we are men, we must care for, and still we will have no Union; for, when, to pro-

vide for our poor wooden-legged men, we tax him with the wooden-leg in the South, there will be a rattling of the dry bones, and, in the words of Mr. Lincoln, "the identical questions as to terms of intercourse are again upon you,"—if you will allow me to perpetrate a Licolnism, no unaccomplished thing is yet accomplished.

The Union is not yet saved. Look you to Mexico, but yesterday a Republic—today a military despotism! How long before we, too, may be involved in foreign complications. If Jeff. Davis and his prime-ministers of treason, are the ambitious ~~heads~~ <sup>hands</sup> of a privileged aristocracy, which they are represented to be, think you they will suffer emancipation, confiscation and the halter rather than seek foreign protection? When they shall be reduced to the alternative of accepting at our hands these very loyal Union-saving offerings, or at the hands of Louis Napoleon, such a government as his protection may offer, and in which these traitors shall not only keep their lives and property, but shall be the favored lords, which do you think they will take? Which would the unconditional Union men take in such an alternative? Such an alternative we would avoid.

But Mr. Lincoln tells us in his Lincoln Springfield letter, "that no compromise embracing the maintenance of the Union is possible, because their army "dominates" over all the Southern people; that any compromise made with the Southern people would be "nothing," because they have no power to enforce their side of it," and then he asks "how such a compromise can keep Lee's army out of Pennsylvania?" And has the author of this knavery so soon forgotten Chicago and the 4th of June? Their army dominates over the Southern people only because Mr. Lincoln and his party made threats against slavery, and refused to the Southern people guarantees that they would not execute these threats, when guarantees were, before the war, demanded; and because they did attempt by the emancipation proclamation to execute these threats as soon as a pretext was given them. Let Mr. Lincoln and his



Cabinet for a time forget the Republican party, and for once rise to the dignity of patriots. Let them reassure the Southern people, and the Southern people will not only compromise, but they will "enforce their side of it;" they will keep Lee's army out of Pennsylvania as did a few thousand men, who know their rights and have the manliness to assert them, keep Mr. Lincoln from the execution of his foul purpose, when he attempted to strike down the liberty of the press, in the suppression of the Chicago Times.

### *The Soldiers.*

Not satisfied with prolonging the sanguinary struggle, and adding "with no lawful right to do so," to the already too great burthens of our citizen soldiery, the Union (with the spoils) men are preparing to use the men they have so wronged to continue the spoils-men in office. Hence, it is that we are by our opponents at all times misrepresented as wanting in sympathy for the men who by perilling their lives have enabled others to remain in the enjoyment of their homes.

When did our citizens, of any political party, assemble together and neglect to express, in fitting terms, their gratitude to, their sympathy for, Illinois soldiers, or fail suitably to commend their sacrifices and devotion to the cause of the country, and in honor of our own State? Does any one of you know of such an occasion? Have not all parties, at all times, expressed a readiness, in the words of that not yet demoralized Democrat of Ohio, Mr. Cox, "to sustain our army in the field while a rebel army contests our authority on a foot of our soil?" Who does not respect and honor the true and manly soldier? Who is his friend, the Republican who votes him thanks, or the Democrat who votes thanks and gives money that his wounds may be healed? we, who would save him to his family, State and country; or his unconditional admirer, who would waste that life-blood so nobly offered in defence of the integrity, rights and honor of the country, in illegal schemes and double purposes not contemplated in the terms of enlistment? It was not

understood by Illinoisans, when they enlisted to maintain the lawful authority of the Government, that they would be required to do what Mr. Lincoln had told them it was unlawful to do. Do you think that when they enlisted they contemplated a time when their shattered and broken columns should be reinforced by the poor debased African? Why should we withhold our sympathy from these gallant men? The misdeeds of the Administration are not those of the soldier any more than they are the misdeeds of you who remain at home and furnish the treasure, while the soldiers offer their lives in the prosecution of the war. Who, of any political party, does not, in his heart of hearts, honor that brave old hero, General Grant,—not a Napoleon, but greater than Napoleon, an earnest, honest man? and that, as true soldier and still greater man, Gen. John A. Rawlings, who can be a General and yet not "make a speech" or write a letter. And the brave and true men of any and every political faith, whether they command or fill the ranks of Illinois' glorious column, who have gone forth in good faith, who know their duty and perform it like men; do we not honor them all alike? nor yet all alike perhaps. If there be political-military hucksters among them, who trade their political opinions for place and power, we honor them not so much, since they have their reward; if not, they may get it when they have made good their contract to give the votes of Democratic soldiers to the Republican party, it may be.

But it is said the last Legislature, Democratic, refused to give to Governor Yates for the relief of the soldiers \$50,000, and the previous Legislature, Republican, did give \$50,000 for that purpose. Well, the State Treasurer, Mr. Starne, tells us, over his own signature, that the official reports show, that of this \$50,000 appropriated by the Republican Legislature to be expended by Gov. Yates, the soldiers received \$1,119; about the sum of \$9,000 was expended in steamboat excursions, chargeable to the soldiers; while of the other \$40,000 which the soldiers did not get, a fellow in the Governor's employ, with a red cravat and nose of the same color, received *more* for

his expenses in a tour from Springfield to Cairo than a soldier receives for fighting rebels nine months. The same fellow is now in the Governor's service in the double capacity of private secretary and common calumniator through the columns of the Missouri Democrat and Chicago Tribune, in the columns of which the Governor's correspondent and private secretary, lately, with no regard for justice or truth, complained of my action in the distribution of the soldiers' relief fund. The appropriations necessary for the relief of our men were not made because of the bad faith, the unwarranted and illegal acts of the Governor and his party. Two weeks after that most terrible battle at Shiloh, the very loyal press—and the private secretary knows why—began with clamorous indecency to laud Gov. Yates for having already brought to their homes the sick and wounded Illinois soldiers; and yet, four weeks after that battle, between eight and nine hundred of them were languishing in the hospitals in sight of the field where they had so nobly vindicated the honor of Illinois and of the whole country. Some of them were sent to hospitals in other States. That noble man and true soldier, Lt. Thos. Maguire of your country, was sent to Cincinnati, and died, thirty days after the battle, among strangers, with no friend or acquaintance to care for him. Yes, he died of his wounds, which Republican votes of thanks—all he could get from his unconditional Union admirers—did not heal. These things, with two or three raids made by the Governor upon the army pending the election on the "new Constitution," had made the Democratic members of the Legislature believe that this trust ought not again be confided to him. But his unconditional friends said: "The Governor so loved the soldiers that it became necessary to have a second baptism, the private secretary standing sponsor and performing the sacred office for 'the soldiers' friend.'" He had given the soldiers \$1,119 in supplies, and \$9,000 in steamboat excursions, out of the \$50,000 appropriated for his expenditure; he had shown his respect for the soldiers' rights and opinions in de-

claring in his message that "every man who has a human heart within him" would receive and treat negroes kindly when they seek a refuge in Illinois, though the soldiers did vote that these negroes should find no refuge here. Therefore, said the Governor's friends, it was an indignity to offer a poor dying soldier relief except by the hand of "the soldiers' friend." The Democrats were of the opinion that, as the men who they proposed should distribute their appropriations were unobjectionable, the Governor might forego his electioneering raids in 1864, and pocket—not the money, but the imaginary indignity, and be satisfied with the relief furnished those for devotion to whom it became necessary to have a second baptism; but "the soldiers' friend" declined to pocket—not the money, but the supposed indignity, and in violation of his legal duty furnished a pretext for his more cowardly accomplices to break up the Legislature.

A bill making the most ample provision for the relief of our disabled and sick men was passed by the House of Representatives early in the first session, and failed to become a law because of the Senate not concurring, twelve, all of the Democratic members, voting for, twelve Republicans voting against the measure. It contained no provision for "the soldiers' friend."

### *Political Parties.*

My friends, it is the fashion of the time, especially with noisy patriots, lucky enough to get a shot which does not stop their talking, *not* to be politicians. If they are very devout christians, they "thank God" that they are *not* politicians—for them, the sufferings, the imaginary wrongs of the soldiers, the star-spangled banner, and the bullet hole, are expected to do the rest. Whoever may or may not be politicians, <sup>there</sup> they are political parties in the country not less assiduous in marshalling their respective hosts for the political conflict in 1864, the conflict of constitutional liberty with military despotism, than are the respective armies intent in preparing for the continuing conflict of arms. One, the party now in pow-

er, claiming all the love of country and of the brave men defending it, enjoying the patronage resulting from the annual disbursement of vast millions of money, exercising the power to create and bestow offices at will. Doubtless they are somewhat desirous to continue their exclusive privilege of so loving the country more, and her soldiers better than other people—somewhat anxious, too, to continue in giving away and keeping the offices, spending and saving the money. To support the Administration in its efforts—the test of loyalty—to save this Union of the party in power, with these unlimited spoils, the eighth commandment, which constitutes no article in the code of military necessity, is by this class of Union savers wholly overlooked; hence, they bear false witness against their neighbors, and represent us as against the Union, Government, country, and the men who give their lives in its defence.

The other, the Democratic party, claim that they alone love the country, with its institutions, in the fullness of their grandeur and glory, as our fathers left them, and desired them to remain until the people, by their own will, in its lawful exercise, should change them; that they, and they alone, can justly appreciate the sacrifices, and will lawfully direct the patriotic efforts of our gallant army of patriot heroes, in the preservation of the Union as our fathers made it; that they alone will prosecute war or maintain peace, without preying upon the resources of the people. Was it not mainly through the faithful guardianship of the Democratic party that this good Government was so long saved from all harm, and in its purity? For

four score years it buoyed up the hopes of civilization, commanded the admiration of mankind, astonished the world. Did any danger manace the country, the Union, the Government, until, in an evil hour, it had been determined to confide them to the keeping of the extra loyal opponents of the Democratic party? All was well until, in a race with four millions of negroes on our backs, their masters firing at our rear, we broke down; the Constitution went into the keeping of Mr. Lincoln, and those who support him in his "efforts;" and if we may believe Mr. Hale, Chandler, Dawes, and Van Wick, like the man who went to Jericho, it *fell* among thieves. We must rescue and restore it to the keeping of those who have been faithful. Providence has an interest in, and might get along with the affairs of this Government without the intervention of the Democratic party; but that experiment has been hazarded only with such success as might cause the angels to weep. The Democratic party must be restored to power—without it the Government cannot be re-adjusted; only through it can a war be prosecuted in no "spirit of oppression," and not for the purpose of overthrowing or of interfering with the rights and established institutions of these States." It is the only party which has not been false to its pledges to prosecute the war "to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution and to preserve the Union, with all the dignity, equality and rights of the several States unimpaired." No other party has capacity to make a successful war, or the virtue to make peace.





